

REMARKS

In this response, Claims 1-2 and 9 are amended. No claims are added, and claim 15 is canceled. Thus, claims 1-6 and 8-13 are now pending in the application. The amendments to the claims as indicated herein do not add any new matter to this application. Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed June 26, 2008 is addressed below.

I. INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank Examiner Keshia Frisby for the courtesy of conducting a personal interview with Brian Hickman, Andy Chen and John Chen, Applicants' representatives, on July 29, 2008. During the personal interview, Applicants' invention was discussed. The Examiner's summary of the interview, including the Examiner's suggestions, is accurate. This response implements those suggestions.

II. ISSUES RELATING TO PRIOR ART

A. CLAIMS 1-4, 7-11 AND 14 --- 35 U.S.C § 102(b)

Claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-11 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,729,882 ("Noble"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent Claims 1, 4, 8 and 11, each independent claim recites at least one "locating" or "determining" step. No such steps are performed by Noble. Instead, Noble functions as a teaching aid used to teach compound words taken from a database of 1446 compound words. See column 28 line 13 through column 31 line 50. While Noble may teach the use of a software program to teach English vocabulary including joining words together, nothing in Noble discloses or suggests any steps corresponding to taking words

apart. Thus Noble fails to anticipate any of independent claims 1, 4, 8, and 11, and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

B. CLAIMS 2, 5-6, 9 AND 12-13 --- 35 U.S.C § 103(a)

Claims 2 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable by Noble, in view of U.S. Patent 6,349,282 (“Van Aelten”).

Van Aelten discloses the detection of compound words in speech recognition systems, in which compound words (received as an “input utterance”) are formed from their components. At best, Van Aelten discloses a method for determining when compound words can be formed, without regard to differing forms of a component word, but instead with regard whether a probability model indicates words are combinable. See, for example, column 7 lines 10-39 and 40-65. Thus, even were it possible to combine Noble and Van Aelten, the combination would fail to read on the feature “locating, within said compound word, a second form of said component word that differs from said first form of said component word” as appears in independent Claims 1 and 8 (and by dependency, Claims 2 and 9). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on the combination of Noble and Van Aelten.

C. CLAIMS 5-6 AND 12-13 --- 35 U.S.C § 103(a)

Claims 5-6 and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable by Noble, in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2003/0187886 (“Hull”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hull discloses techniques to simultaneously highlight both a physical and electronic versions of a document using a so-called “sequentialness” score that is unrelated to determining a first stem word and a second stem word associated with the compound; instead Hull is looking for a word-to-word match between documents. See paragraphs [0030] and

[0031]. Thus, even were it possible to combine Noble and Hull, the combination would fail to read on the feature “locating, within said compound word, a second form of said component word that differs from said first form of said component word” as appears in independent Claims 1 and 8 (and by dependency, Claims 2 and 9). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on the combination of Noble and Hull.

III. CONCLUSION

The pending claims not discussed so far are dependent claims that depend on an independent claim that is discussed above. Because each of the dependent claims include the limitations of claims upon which they depend, the dependent claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependent claims depend are patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependent claims and allowance of the dependent claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If applicable, a law firm check for the petition for extension of time fee is

enclosed herewith. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: August 18, 2008

/Samuel S. Broda #54802/
Samuel S. Broda
Reg. No. 54,802

2055 Gateway Place Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1093
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext 239
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076